DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 224 180 EC 150 049

AUTHOR Canipe, Sharon W.
TITLE The Education of Gifted Children: A Case Study.
PUB DATE 80
NOTE 19p.; Print in original document is poor.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS Compliance (Legal); Educational Policy; Elementary Secondary Education; *Gifted; *Individualized Education Programs; Program Development; State Legislation; State Programs; *Talent
IDENTIFIERS Charlotte Mecklenburg Public Schools NC; *Education for All Handicapped Children Act

ABSTRACT

The paper examines the intergovernmental relationships in policy making for the development of programs for gifted and talented students. A review of studies on provision of programs for gifted children cites inadequate and unevenly distributed services and analyzes the effects of PL 94-142, the Education for All Handicapped Children Act on expanded services to the gifted. The program for gifted students in Charlotte-Mecklenburg, North Carolina, schools is focused upon, including the state law and issues related to racial nondiscrimination. Admission standard changes and their possible racial ramifications are noted. Possible difficulties in providing individualized education programs (IEPs) to gifted students are discussed as is the lack of funds for gifted programing. (CL)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED224180

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION
CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official NIE position or policy.

THE EDUCATION OF GIFTED CHILDREN:

A CASE STUDY

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sharon W. Canipe

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Sharon W. Canipe
HDL 570-L
Dr. George Antonelli

Fall 1980

EC150049

In a federal system of government such as we have here in the United States, the legal life of the individual citizen is complicated by the necessity of dealing with both federal and state legislation in various areas. While, in some areas, federal laws clearly supercede state legislation, this is not always the case. Laws passed by Congress have a ripple effect, often leading to passage of new state laws or changing the application of state laws passed earlier. In addition to the acts of state and federal legislatures, judicial decisions have further impact upon the legal framework of society. Local governing bodies are much like individual citizens or corporations in that they have to operate in this context of overlapping laws and court decisions. To further complicate matters, state and federal executive agencies and departments weave an additional overlay of administrative regulation to the legal web in which local governing bodies live.

Education offers many fine examples of intergovernmental relations at work; for, while public schools may be locally operated, they must function in accordance with state and federal laws and administrative regulations. On top of this, recent years have brought a myriad of court decisions impacting education.

This paper will offer a brief look at intergovernmental relationships in one small area of educational policy-making, the establishment of programs for gifted and talented students. More specific attention will be given to the program in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools because of this writer's greater familiarity with that system. Before turning to the case of Charlotte-Mecklenburg

however, it might be useful to briefly examine the current state of gifted education nationwide.

Studies reveal that as recently as 20 years ago, our talented youth were often not receiving adequate educational services. A 1957 study of 251 children identified as "gifted" or "talented" found that 54.6% were working below the level of which they were capable. In 1960 Project Talent found 13% of such students had no ambition for post-secondary schooling. A 1962 study in Iowa found that 1/5 of their gifted students were dropouts![1]

States and localities have generally developed their own standards for evaluating and identifying talented children. The U.S. Office of Education assumes that at least 3% of the school-age population is gifted. Based on 1976-77 figures, this group would number approximately 1,350,000.[2] The individual talents and characteristics may vary widely--identification is not without its difficulty; however, all should be recognized by some widely accepted standard as being near the top of the population in potential. Educators who are experienced with such children report, however, that many of them become bored and apathetic when they are not sufficiently challenged. Some become disruptive behavior problems, while others may lose motivation and may actually exhibit a decline in academic performance.[3] From the

[1]Zettel, Jeffrey & Ballard, Joseph,"A Need for Increased Federal Effort for the Gifted and TAlented," Exceptional Children 44(January 1978): 263.

[2]Mitchell, Patricia & Erickson, Donald,"The Education of Gifted and Talented Children: A Status Report,"Exceptional Children 45 (September 1978):12.

[3]Flora Buntley, Curriculum Specialist Charlotte-Mecklenburg Academically Talented Program, Personal Interview.

foregoing information, it seems reasonable to assume that a sizeable number of children are in need of special educational services for the gifted if they are to realize their full potential.

A 1971 study by U.S. Commissioner of Education, Sidney Marland, concluded that programs for the gifted were almost nonexistent. As a result, 1972 saw the addition of an Office of Gifted and Talented to the Office of Education. In 1974, $2.5 million was appropriated to help state and local education agencies develop programs and extend personnel training.[4]

As a follow-up, the Office of Gifted and Talented commissioned a new study in 1976 to be conducted by the Council for Exceptional Children (hereafter referred to as CEC). The results of this study are summarized below.[5]

The CEC found that 32 states had identified and were serving 437,618 gifted children. The range of school-age children included was from .06% to 4.5%, while the mean was 1.5%. However, 2 states served more than 3% of their student population.

Eighty-four percent of the states (43) had some type of written policy covering the education of the gifted. Thirty-eight states had a written definition of talented children, but only 30 had established identification procedures and only 27 had guidelines for specific services to be rendered.

In 1971 only 10 states had a person designated to spend more than 50% of their time working with programs for the gifted.

[4]Mitchell & Erickson, p. 12.

[5]Mitchell & Erickson pp. 12-15. (As all information concerning this study came from this source , no other footnotes will be used in this section.)

However, by 1977, 27 states had at least one full time person (seven had 2 or 3), and 14 others had a half-time person.

Reports on funding were somewhat irregular. Data were requested concerning federal and state funds for both 1975-76 and 1976-77. Only 14 states could provide complete data for both years. In those states total appropriations for 1976-77 were $27,384,316, a 26.48% increase over 1975-76. State funds accounted for 93.1% of the total. Nineteen states reported federal funds of $3,219,162 for 1976-77, a 47.67% increase over 1975-76. Twenty-three states reported state appropriations of $47,076,154 in 1976-77. The survey results reveal that about 95% of all funding for gifted student programs comes from the states and 8 states accounted for 91.8% of the state funds appropriated.

The CEC also found that an increasing number of states had inservice programs and college courses available to prepare teachers to work with gifted youngsters.

While noting that a commitment ahd been made and the status of educational programs for the gifted had improved, the Council concluded that services were still inadequate and were very unevenly distributed. Among 26 states reporting both federal and state funds spent, the range in per pupil expenditure was from $4 to $622. The CEC clearly felt that there remained much to be done in educating the academically talented.

The issue of students with special educational needs has become a major focus in education in recent years. In fact much of the recent legal activity in the field has focused on special education cases and related litigation.. Interestingly enough, the origin of much of this litigation has been traced to the case of Brown v. Board of Education of Topeka,(347 U.S. 483,493(1954)).

> In the landmark Brown desegregation case, the Supreme Court declared that once a state elects to provide public education,"it is a right which must be made available to all on equal terms." This declaration initiated an explosive chain reaction which has caused many discriminatory and arbitrary school policies to come under judicial scrutiny. For over two decades courts have been grappling with the nature of equality required in public schools and the correlative constraints placed on the sovereign powers of the state by this Brown mandate.[6]

Up to the present time, most of the litigation surrounding special educational needs has dealt with mentally retarded children or those with physical handicaps, learning disabilities, emotional disturbances, etc. However, many specialists in the area of gifted education feel that eventually a major court case will arise in this area. In fact, in 1979 an Illinois father brought suit against his local school district for failure to offer a curriculum adequate to the needs of his gifted child. This case raises the question of whether gifted children, like handicapped children, have legal rights to special education.[7] (Every effort was made to locate the name of this case and information as to its outcome, however, the search was unsuccessful.)

The end result of the drive to legally mandate special educational programs for the handicapped was the passage in 1975 of Public Law 94-142. This now familiar law mandates a "free, appropriate public school education in the least restrictive environment" for all handicapped children ages 3-18, and

[6]McCarthy, Martha Mc. & Thomas, Stephen B., "The Right to an Education: New Trends Emerging From Special Education Litigation," NOLPE School Law Journal 7(First Qtr. 1977):76.

[7]Education Daily, May 4, 1979.p.2.

eventually through age 21.[8] P.L. 94-142 has brought about a requirement that Individualized Education Programs (IEPS) be prepared for all students classified as eligible for special services. The law spells out strict guidelines of due process to be followed in the formulation and implementation of these IEPS. In most of the nation IEP requirements apply only to handicapped youngsters; however, Pennsylvania, Idaho, Florida, and North Carolina have also adopted these requirements for the academically gifted.[9] North Carolina's requirements will be examined more closely in the context of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg schools shortly.

It is becoming more apparent daily that P.L. 94-142 has opened the door to an ever-widening array of special programs and demands for meeting all kinds of special needs. It is highly likely that special education for the gifted will the expanded as a result.

A recent article by Ellen Kester urged parents of gifted children to awaken to the potentialities of P.L. 94-142.

> P.L. 94-142 requires study on the part of all parents as well as educators. This 1975 event has signaled a revolution--this time in our public school system. Parents of the gifted, as well as of the handicapped must apprise themselves of all its minute stipulations. Like Paul Revere's 1775 ride and the revolutionary era he proclained, these times require alert parents"ready to ride and spread the alarm," because new possibilities are in the offing. P.L. 94-142 is going to illumine more than the nees of the handicapped. It can be a harbinger for better educational accomodations for all children--including the gifted.[10]

[8]Kester, Ellen,"P.L. 94-142:Spread the Alarm," The Creative Child and Adult Quarterly 3 (Summer 1978):117-121.

[9]Lewis, Christine L. & Kanes, Lelage G."Gifted IEPS: Impact of Expectations and Perspectives." Journal for the Education of the Gifted 2(Winter 1979):61

[10]Kester, p. 117.

Supporters of more and better education for the gifted basically argue that it is unfair for some groups of children with special needs to receive large amounts of attention and support while gifted children, whose needs are also great, receive much less upport comparatively. They point to evidence gathered in the Marland report and similar studies referred to earlier to support their case.

Public Law 94-142 has already impacted education for the gifted in North Carolina. An examination of the program in the Charlotte-Mecklenburg schools reveals this. However, the program in Charlotte has also been affected by other legal requirements, including desegregation guidelines imposed following the case of Swann Vs. Board of Education. Let us now examine education for gifted children in Charlotte-Mecklenburg with special emphasis on the impact of state law and federal regulation.

When considering the Gifted and Talented (GT) Program in Charlotte, one must first examine the foundation in state law upon which this program rests. It may seem a bit unusual that gifted and talented children are coupled under the same law which deals with handicapped children. In fact, the first definition of a "child with special needs"(1974) seemed particularly absurd when applied to the gifted:

> any child who because of temporary or permanent disabilities arising from intellectual, sensory, emotional, physical, environmental factors, or other specific learning disability is inhibited from achieving his full potential.[11]

IN 1977 a new law was passed by the NOrth Carolina General Assembly which superceded the 1974 law. It also included the gifted child but this time the definition was more appropriate:

[11] "An Act to Establish Equal Educational Opportunities in the Public Schools and for Other Purposes"Senate Bill 1238 (1973-74) Public School Laws of North Carolina.

> those unable to have all their needs met in a regular class without special education or related services.[12]

However, the fact remains that House Bill 824, better known as the Creech Bill, dealt primarily with the education of the handicapped. In some respects this has posed a problem for educators working with gifted children.

The primary purpose of the Creech Bill was to bring North Carolina law into conformity with the federal Education for all Handicapped Children Act (P.L. 94-142) and to implement that law in this state. However, North Carolina included gifted children which the federal law does not do. Public Law 94-142 called for Individual Educational Programs for all handicapped students. The Creech Bill made requirements for IEPS applicable for gifted children as well as handicapped youngsters in North Carolina. As we shall see this is sometimes a problem.

In addition to the Creech Bill, Charlotte's program must also conform to rules and guidelines established by the Division of Exceptional Children of the State Department of Public Instruction. These rules provide a relatively broad definition of gifted and talented students as:

> those students who (1) possess demonstrated or potential intellectual, creative or specific academic abilities or leadership capability and (2) need differentiated educational services beyond those being provided by the regular school program in order to realize these potentialities for self and society.[13]

[12]"An Analysis of House Bill 824," Division for Exceptional Children, State Dept. of PUblic Instruction, October, 1977.

[13]Rules Governing Programs and Sources for Children With Special Needs., Division for Exceptional Children, State Department of PUblic INstruction, Raleigh, N.C. 1978, p.16.

Criteria are established for selection of students which require that multiple means be used. These standards are undergoing change; however, they still include use of standardized intelligence and achievement tests, school performance through grades and/or projects, recommendations from school personnel, and behavioral scales and checklists.[14] Proposed changes contain no specific test score or grade cut off,(previously 90th percentile scores and a B average were required) and include a Student Identification Profile developed by the Division of Exceptional Children. Provision is made for the use of additional data to assess students who have narrowly missed selection and to insure non-discrimination.[15]

Selection of students is complicated by the issue of non-discimination. Neither Public Law 94-142, nor the Creech Bill mention factors of race; however, federal aid may be removed from any school system if it has:

> any policy or practice which results in discrimination against children because of race, color, or national origin.[16]

These policies include any type of ability grouping or special educational programs. The law further states that unless racially identifiable classes can be justified according to certain criteria, they are presumed to be discriminatory.[17] Bona fide ability grouping is allowable if based on objective measurements and standards applied in a non-discriminatory manner. The law specifically mentions programs which are

14 [14] Rules, pp. 6-7.

[15] Proposed Revisions in Rules Governing Programs and Services for Children with Special Needs. Division of Exceptional Children State Department of Public Instruction, Raleigh, 1979, p. 16.

[16] Section 185.43 (d)(5) and (c) of ESEA Regulations

[17] Section 185.43

designed for less academically advanced groups which raises questions about programs for the gifted.[18]

To simplify a complex situation--Public Law 94-142 and the Creech Bill do not include questions of race in spelling out what is to be done for children in need of special educational programs (except of course to assure equal opportunity for all children in need of services). Rules written by the State Department of Public Instruction recognize the fact that local administrative units might need to "make adjustments" for purposes of non-discrimination. However, federal laws which provide financial aid for school systems call for firm policies of non-discrimination.

The question of non-discrimination is particularly important for Charlotte-Mecklenburg because of our particular history. For several years after the Supreme Court decision in Swann vs. the Board of Education, our schools were directly monitored by JUdge James McMillan of the federal district court. Since release from the direct supervision of the court we have been closely monitored by the Atlanta office, Division of Civil Rights, Department of Health, Education and Welfare. (In 1979 Congress abolished HEW and created two new departments, one a Department of Education. The Civil Rights Division still exists, however, and monitoring continues.) Among educational professionals th Atlanta office is viewed as more rigid in monitoring school programs than the Washington headquarters.

It is presently Charlotte's policy to allow no racially identifiable classes in required, regular courses and to make every effort to reduce racial identification in elective courses.[19]

18 Public Law 92-318,Section 706 (d)(1)(d).

19 Robinson Dr. Jay. Memo. July 22 1977.

A class or program is considered to be racially identifiable when it deviates more than 20% from the minority percentage in that particular school. This figure apparently derives from earlier court orders.

Thus, the problem for the Gifted and Talented Program becomes one of meshing state selection criteria with standards of non-discrimination, so as to not endanger the system's federal funds or cause the Swann case to be reopened.

Three years ago the state criteria called for the top 10% of white students and the top 10% of Black students (based on the selection criteria) to be placed in the program. Now the requirement simply says that all students admitted to the program should be performing two years above grade level. If stanine scores are used and 5 is considered average performance, academically talented students should be rated 7. In 1978-79 white students were admitted with a rating of 7 and blacks with a 5. For 1979-80, the requirement for white students was 7.3, for blacks it was 6. Thus white students were slightly more than two years above grade level , while blacks were only one year ahead. The discrepancy was even greater at the secondary level where black students admitted to the program under earlier, less stringent requirements ranked as low as the 4th stanine.[20]

In part, the tightening was a result of the desire of the local school system to reduce the number of students served to 4-5% of the total school population. In 1978 16% of the children were in programs for gifted students.[21] This figure does seem excessive when one considers other definitions of giftedness. As a result

[20] Davis, poster,"The Bright Lights" Editorial, The Charlotte Observer , May 26, 1979.

[21] Davis.

of these large number, elementary GT students are taught by a special resource teacher only 45 minutes per week. Parents are unhappy about this and are pressuring for change.

In 1979 a committee of citizens and educators studied the program. They endorsed a reduction in the number of students served and this year new standards, which meet fully the state requirements, were adopted for admission to the program in grades 2,7, and 9. This is intended to continue, phasing out the old selection criteria and reducing the numbers served. State law and regulation made these changes necessary; however, these changes may create problems if tightened standards make it more difficult to enroll minority students in the program and, if white parents whose children are no longer admitted raise a cry of reverse discrimination.

This latter situation is not unrealistic or far-fetched when one notes that one purpose of the Creech Bill is "to ensure the absence of inadequacies, inequities, and discrimination with respect to children with special needs."[22]

It should be noted that NOrth Carolina law does permit a parent to call for a due process hearing if he objects to his child's placement after evaluation. Presumably a parent whose child was denied placement in a program for the gifted could also call for such a hearing.[23]

Thus selection of students and policies of non-discrimination form a problem area for the Charlotte-Mecklenburg program for the

[22]"Analysis of House Bill 824" p. 16.

[23] Turnbull, H. Rutherford,"Recent State Legislation on Education of the Handicapped" School Law Bulletin , Vol ix, NO.4, April, 1978. p. 8.

gifted and talented. At present admission standards for some black students are in technical violation of state selection guidelines. However, this is tolerated by the state because of federal requirements.

Another problem area concerns the requirement for Individual Educational Programs (IEPS) for children with special educational needs. P.L. 94-142 provides that the IEP be a written statement which includes the following:

1. the child's present level of performance
2. annual goals and short-term instructional objectives
3. specific services to be provided
4. the extent to which the child may participate in the regular classroom
5. projected date for initiation of services and their duration
6. evaluation criteria and procedures
7. a schedule for determining if objectives are being achieved.[24]

The Creech Bill put North Carolina in conformity with federal requirements. The IEP is to be developed by a school based committee including a supervisor of special education (or the equivalent), the teacher, the parents, and the child (when appropriate). The plan is established at the start of the school year and is to be evaluated and revised annually.[25]

The purpose of the IEP is obviously a good one, especially if one considers the needs of the handicapped child. It provides a means of thinking through goals and expectations, of involving all concerned parties in planning, and of evaluating a child's growth and learning. As one local legislator quipped, to vote against the IEP was like voting against Motherhood and apple pie!

[24] "Analysis of House Bill 824"p.16.

[25] Ibid.

When the IEP is used as intended it would involve an individual conference for each child, at least once per year. When one considere that resource teachers for gifted children may see as many as 175 pupils per week,[26] one can begin to see how IEPS can be problematical. In addition, if the true spirit of the law is fulfilled, the local supervisor of gifted programs would have to participate in each planning conference. In Charlotte, where nearly 12,000 students are involved this would be clearly impossible. Actually, the direct involvement of supervisors in conferences on a routine basis in not practical in most special programs.

When one considers class loads, it is easy to see that the IEPS provide an especially heavy burden for teachers of gifted students. As I previously mentioned, resource teachers may see 175 pupils per week (this is the way elementary students are served in Charlotte). Those teachers with part-time special classes or departmental block classes(the typical situation in secondary schools) may have 25 per class, up to 100 students per day. Full time special classes may have 26 pupils. Advanced Placement classes should have 20 students per class.[27]

Class loads in other special educational programs are considerably smaller. The largest classes contain 15 students and a few contain only 6 or 7 students.

In order to meet the letter of the law, the Charlotte GT program has devised a format for an IEP with the overall supervision of the specialist.. Teachers work with students in completeing the form. Parents go over the plan with their children at home and may request a conference--most do not. In order to

[26] Rules, 1978.,p.16

[27] Ibid.

keep the program workable the IEP has been reduced to mere paperwork. The law is obeyed, but this is not what was intended.

One can see the value of individualizing educational programs, but it is not possible to do this merely by passing a law. It is hard to believe that the legislature intended the Creech Bill to be reduced to a case of added paperwork yet, in the case of gifted students, this is often what has happened.

Do gifted students need individualized educational programs? If one can justify placing them in the category of children with special needs, then perhaps they do. I would agree that some do--particularly those who may be lacking in motivation or self-direction--those who might be called underachievers. Many gifted students however, are highly motivated with strong personal goals. If such students should have individualized programs, then all students should have such programs. To do this would require major restructuring of our educational system.

This is perhaps the greatest problem posed by the present trend toward locally mandated special education programs. The generous funding available for those who qualify under categories of P.L. 94-142 creates a temptation to create new programs for other "special" categories. Indeed the biggest concern expressed by those working with the gifted in North Carolina is that the Creech Bill forces them to comply with parts of 94-142 but, since 94-142 doesn't include the gifted, large amounts of monies for teacher training, personnel, and materials are not available. Where does this leave the rest of us--the so-called normal children in our schools. Martha McCarthy and Stephen Thomas have expressed it very well:

...Recent years have witnessed a judicial trend toward mandating full educational services for the 'special' child.- Courts have ordered states to provide instructional programs which are individually designed and appropriate to the unique needs of handicapped and other'special' children. On the other hand, there has been a judicial tendency to require only a minimal level of education--perhaps one of homeostasis--for the 'normal' child. ... The courts, in accepting the very emotional arguments of special education proponenets may be opening a Pandora's box for future legal battles involving students with other types of special needs. ...is there a denial of fundamental rights when stringent due process and accountability procedures are mandated for 'special' children while the 'normal' child's fate is left in the hands of school officials? ...perhaps future cases will extend the educator's accountability to include the mainstream student. ...
...Current directions need to be carefully assessed for warning signs as to what future legal contests may entail. Will courts require that the needs of other classes of students such as the musically talented or academically gifted be addressed by public schools? Will advocates of the 'normal' child capitalize on precedents regarding special education to demand that public school programs appropriately meet the divergent needs of all students? And if so, will the total school program become diluted from well-intentioned but misdirected attempts to provide equal educational opportunities? Or will a double standard prevail regarding criteria to measure the quality of educational programs for 'normal' versus 'special' children? If these and similar questions are not addressed soon, an entire generation of children may be inadvertently disadvantaged by our public school system.[28]

[28] McCarthy & Thomas, p. 86-87.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

"An Act to Establish Equal Educational Opportunities in the Public Schools and for Other Purposes" Senate Bill 1238 enacted 1973-74. Public School Laws of North Carolina.

"An Analysis of House Bill 824," Division for Exceptional Children, State Department of PUblic Instruction, October, 1977.

Davis, Foster,"The Bright Lights" Editorial, The Charlotte Observer, May 26, 1979.

Education Daily May 4, 1979.

Huntly, Flora, Curriculum Specialist Charlotte-Mecklenburg Academically Talented Program, Personal Interview.

Koster, Ellen, "P.L. 94-142:Spread the Alarm!" The Creative and Adult Quarterly 3(Summer 1978): 117-121.

Lewis, Christine L. and Kanes, Lelage G., "Gifted IEPS: Impact of Expectations and Perspectives." Journal for the Education of the Gifted 2(Winter 1979):61.

McCarthy, Martha M. & Thomas, Stephen B.,"The Right to an Education: New Trends Emerging From Special Education Litigation," NOLPE School Law Journal 7(First Qtr. 1977):76.

Mitchell, Patricia P. & Erickson, Donald K." The Education of Gifted and Talented Children," Exceptional Children 45 (September 1978):12.

Proposed Revisions in Rules Governing Programs and Services for Children with Special Needs. Division of Exceptional Children, State Department of Public Instruction, Raleigh 1979.

Public Law 92-318, Section 706 (d)(1)(d)/

Robinson, Dr. Jay, Supt. Charlotte-Mecklenburg Schools, Memo to Secondary School Principals, July 22, 1977.

Rules Governing Programs and SErvices for Children with Special Needs. Division of Exceptional Children, State DEpartment of PUblic Instruction, Raleigh, 1978.

Section 185.43 (d)(5) and (c) of ESEA Regulations.

Turnbull, Rutherford,"Recent State Legislation on Educating the Handicapped,"School Law Bulletin, Vol. ix, No. 4 April, 1978. p. 8.

Zettel, Jeffrey and Ballard, Joseph,"A Need for Increased Federal Effort for the Gifted and Talented,"Exceptional Children 44(January 1978): 263.